STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Initially, Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for conducting an interview with Applicant's attorney, David K. Sakata, on June 6, 2008. Applicant sincerely wishes to thank the Examiner for his insight and cooperation.

During the interview, Applicant presented arguments distinguishing proposed claims from the cited references. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the rejections, several proposed amendments were discussed. For instance, Applicant's attorney proposed amending claim 1 to recite "initial entropy data." Applicant's attorney then argued that the cited reference does not disclose or suggest "storing the initial entropy data in a nonvolatile memory." Specifically, it was argued that the reference only stores data that has been hashed. No agreement was reached. Nevertheless, Applicant has included this amendment as shown above.

Applicant's attorney also proposed the following amendment to claim 1: "wherein the central processing unit data is comprised of: (i) a timestamp counter; (ii) a number of cache misses per second ; (iii) a number of branch mispredictions per second; (iv) power fluctuations; (v) a clock speed at which a central processing unit (CPU) is running; or (vi) CPU-specific counters." Finally, Applicant's attorney proposed the addition of the following new dependent claim: "wherein generating a string of random bits includes: (i) producing a first result by hashing the updated entropy data with a first hashing algorithm; (ii) producing a second result by hashing the updated entropy data with a second hashing algorithm that is

different from the first hashing algorithm; and (iii) concatenating the first result with the second result." Applicant understood the Examiner to tentatively agree that including this subject matter would move prosecution forward. Therefore, solely in the interest of advancing prosecution and without giving propriety to the rejections, Applicant has included this subject matter in the claims.

Thus, the pending claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons discussed during the interview.